



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/450,261	11/29/1999	RANDY P. STANLEY	INTL-0289-US	7389

7590 03/18/2003

TIMOTHY N TROP  
TROP PRUNER HU & MILES PC  
8554 KATY FREEWAY  
SUITE 100  
HOUSTON, TX 77024

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/450,261

Applicant(s)

STANLEY, RANDY P.

Examiner

Kenny Lin

Art Unit

2154

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See attached paper.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.Claim(s) objected to: none.Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: see attached paper



MENG-AL T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

1. The request for reconsideration has been entered and considered but does not overcome the rejection because:

- a. Applicant argues that (1) Tsukakoshi teaches away from having one storage coupled to a processor-based system where another storage and a display are coupled to the other processed-based system for automatically enabling the display of information that is automatically transferred. (2) Tsukakoshi's system cannot teach automatic transfer of the time sensitive data for automatic display since transferring of the data can be denied due to difference in between the memory capacities. (3) Tsukakoshi fails to teach or disclosed automatic display of the time sensitive data since a physical separation is required.
- b. As to point (1), examiner has addressed in the final rejection that Tsukakoshi taught a system for transferring time sensitive data (col.1, lines 24-34, 49-59, col.3, lines 40-55, col.4, lines 42-44, Tables 4 and 5) from a storage coupled to a first processor-based system (fig.1, col.1, lines 20-23) to a storage coupled to a second processor-base system (fig.1, col.1, lines 41-67, col.2, lines 1-13, col.6, lines 1-14); and display time sensitive data on a display (16, fig.1, col.6, lines 1-10, col.9, lines 21-24, col.11, lines 4-8) coupled to second processor-based system.
- c. As to point (2), examiner has already address the argument in final rejection that Tsukakoshi disclosed a system that would transfer the time sensitive data that had been edited by the PIM software when certain criteria are met without user intervention (col.1, lines 53-64, col.3, line 65 to col.4, line 4, lines 9-11, 16-23,

42-44, col.10, lines 48-60). Tsukakoshi taught not only to automatically transfer the data but also checked to verify if the second processor-based system is able to store the transferred data. Furthermore, to avoid the denial of data transferring in Tsukakoshi's system, one would be motivated to provide equal memory capacity to both processor-based systems and also eliminate the need for checking memory capacity in the second processor-based system.

- d. As to point (3), Nowhere in Tsukakoshi's reference stated that a physical separation or user accession is required in order for the data to be automatically displayed. Tsukakoshi taught that PIM information is transferred. Since automatic displaying of PIM information is well known in the art, it would have been obvious that the transferred PIM information, to a device that contains PIM software, can be automatically displayed. In addition, such transferring of data can be done using wireless communication (see Philipson et al).
- e. Examiner respectfully request the applicant to again view references Deo et al, US 6,356,956, specifically column 2, lines 21-35, column 5, lines 47-55, Philipson et al, US 6,334,046, specifically column 2, lines 7-14, column 3, lines 3-5, as regarding to automatic transferring of time sensitive data. View reference Hallowell et al, US 5,920,728, specifically column 3, lines 11-15, as regarding to execute instructions such as saving or transferring files prior to system shut down. All listed references here were cited in the previous office actions and support each instance where official notice was taken.